



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,496	12/22/2005	John D. Lambris	UPN-4470	4405
26691 7590 06/22/2010 POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP ATTN: JANET E. REED, PH.D. P.O. BOX 951 WILMINGTON, DE 19899-0951				
			EXAMINER	
			AUDET, MAURY A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1654	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/22/2010 PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/528,496

**Applicant(s)**

LAMBRIS, JOHN D.

**Examiner**

MAURY AUDET

**Art Unit**

1654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 March 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/7/07
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

SN 11/605,182 is also compending (later filed then present; Final Rejection based on Double Patenting over present application and 102(b) over WO 2004/026328; a later publication after the present applications priority date is 9/20/02).

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-9, in the reply filed on 6/12/06 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that it the variable genus SEQ ID NO: 15 should be searched/examined in its entirety. This is found persuasive, the restriction to a single peptide vacated, and the traversal deemed moot.

As to the election of Group I in the same reply filed is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement election of Group I (versus Groups II-III), this part of the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Applicant refers to all amino acids options by their three-letter acronym, except the last two in claim 6. For consistency, though not rising to the level of an antecedent basis issue (since Thr is e.g. threonine) should consider amending the last two amino acids in claim 6 to their three-letter acronym.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

[As also applied, though in reverse order, in SN 11/605,182].

Claims 1-2 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4, 7-16 and 18-24 of copending Application No. SN 11/605,182. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims are drawn to a compound that inhibits complement activation, comprising a peptide having a sequence: Xaa1-Cys-Val-Xaa2-Gln-Asp-Xaa3-Gly-Xaa4-His-Arg-Cys-Xaa5; wherein: Xaa1 is Ac-Ile; Xaa2 is an analog of Trp; Xaa3 is Trp; Xaa4 is Ala; xaa5 is L-Thr. The '496 application recites essentially the same compound that inhibits complement activation.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 1-9, as drawn to the variable sequence of SEQ ID NO: 15 (and species SEQ ID NOS; thereof, by dependent claims), was not found to be reasonably taught or suggested by the prior art of record (but for Obvious Double Patenting above), based on an STN structural database search. Were the non-elected claims 10-17 cancelled without prejudice (drawn to non-overlapping distinct products) and a Terminal Disclaimer filed over SN 11/605,182, the application would likely receive favorable consideration, pending the final updated search of the art prior to allowance.

***Conclusion***

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MAURY AUDET whose telephone number is (571)272-0960. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th. 7AM-5:30PM (10 Hrs.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang can be reached on 571-272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MA, 6/20/2010

/Maury Audet/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1654